OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI PRITHVIRAJ CHAVAN): Sir, I am happy to inform the august House that the Scientists of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), working at the Institute of Genomics and Integrative Biology (IGIB), for the first time, have successfully decoded the full human genome in India. Sir, the first human genome sequence in the world was a result of International Human Genome Project comprising of scientists of six countries. This large collaborative Project began in 1990, and the sequencing was completed in 2003. This spectacular feat, at that time, was hailed equivalent to the man landing on the moon. India could not be part of this initiative in early 1990s because of resource constraints. With the completion of first few human genomes sequence in India, we are now in the league of few selected countries like the United States, the United Kingdom, China, Canada and Korea. Scientists at CSIR could achieve this feat by adopting new technology and by effectively integrating complex computational and bioinformatics tools with high throughput analytical capability using super-computers. The sequencing of first human genome in India, therefore, sets the stage for India's entry into the elite club which will open up new possibilities in diagnostics, treatment and low-cost affordable healthcare in future for the masses.

———————

## CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE — *Contd.*

### Present status of the WTO negotiations

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI ARUN JAITLEY): Sir, the Doha round almost stands stalemated. In my view, Sir, there are few basic reasons that this appears to be happening. Sir, there are three changes which have taken place over the last one decade in the global trade negotiations. Initially, the trade negotiations were essentially driven by the developed world. Today, there is a change of imbalance of power. Today, the developing countries, particularly after the formation of several groups like G-20, have also acquired a say in the functioning of the WTO and in the negotiations. So, the balance of power itself has slightly altered. The second is a change in the global economy which has taken place that across the world, consumers prefer to buy services and goods which are cheaper and are of the best quality. Therefore, instead of the developed world, the balance with regard to services and with regard to goods is now tilting in favour of low-cost economies. As a result of this, we get some obvious advantages. The third, Sir, is a change in the agenda also. Initially, the agenda in relation to agriculture was market access. And, today, it is being counter-balanced by the whole suggestion that there cannot be market access; trade distortions in form of trade

distorting subsidies are reduced, rationalised and some of them even finally eliminated. Sir, Mr. N.K. Singh put a very relevant question with regard to the state of negotiations in the services sector. Now, this is one sector in which India is capable of providing the world with a very large number of low-cost services, both in the matter of movement of natural persons and also in the matters relating to various other forms of services, including outsourcing etc. Now, the service negotiations, instead of being multilateral, are either bilateral or plurilateral, for which offers and responses are going on. Obviously, it appears that the developed world is not very keen, as far as the pace of these negotiations is concerned. In the services sector, they are keen essentially on areas like financial services, retail being opened up, and there is a conscious go-slow as far as these areas of keen interest to India are concerned. So, my first query to the Minister is: what is the position of negotiations as far as the services sector, particularly, in these areas is concerned.

Secondly, Sir, agriculture is of key interest to us for the reason that more than sixty per cent of India is employed, or, even, under employed, as far as agriculture is concerned. Now, the agricultural negotiations have virtually been stalemated, and, today, the key to the entire pace of movement in the WTO is such that the manufacturing sector, the NAMA negotiations, the services negotiations are not moving because agricultural negotiations are stalemated. And, the reason why agricultural negotiations is stalemated is that unless the subsidies are rationalised, some of them completely eliminated, and, some of them substantially reduced, there can't be a level-playing field. We cannot expect our subsistence farmer to compete with the highly subsidised farmer who gets almost a billion dollars a day from the developed economies in the world towards his subsidisation; his products are going to be much cheaper than ours, and, will, obviously, push us out of the market.

Now, as far as the subsidies are concerned, various proposals are there. The Minister in his statement has said, "the negotiating groups brought out a revised modality on 6th December, 2008". I have two fears as far as the blanks in these drafts are concerned. And, my two questions in this area relate to these blanks. Firstly, Sir, as far as the subsidies are concerned, even though there is a broad consensus building up that the export subsidies should be finally eliminated, with regard to the other form of subsidies, it is not the green box subsidies, which are going unregulated in the name of environment protection and livestock protection, even the amber box and the blue box subsidies, there is a lot of box-shifting which is taking place in the various proposals. And, the net consequence is going to be that the amount of money which goes into the pocket of the farmer in the developed countries substantially will not come down over the next decade or more, and, if in the hope of this being somewhat altered

because of the drafts, and, the actual money not coming down, we open our markets to agriculture, the consequence will be an inflow of agricultural products from all over the world, which our farmers will not compete with. Even if we keep our tariffs high, Sir, any surplus, if we have, will not be able to get into the global market, will be dumped into our own markets, and, therefore, will depress our markets. So, in either case, the subsidised agriculture, whether it enters our markets or not, is destructive of the interests of the Indian farmer. Therefore, what is the specific proposal which you have, and, what is the kind of figure, in relation to each of these areas of subsidy, which the Government of India thinking of putting across as far as the negotiations are concerned.

Sir, the second question on agriculture is equally important, and, the question is, what is the proposal on the table to reduce the customs tariffs on various agricultural products as far as the developed and the developing countries are concerned? Sir, India has an approximately 692-odd tariff lines, unless the figure has now somewhat altered. Now, these changes are going to be brought about in the duty-structures on the bound rates. If we go by the figures — which we are now reading, particularly, in the international media — of reduction of approximately 30-odd per cent as far as countries like India is concerned, on how many of our tariff lines, will our bound rates come down in comparison to our present applied rates. If many of them in the Doha Round get protected, the real danger will then arise in the post-Doha Round, that is, the next round, where the figure, instead of 70 - 80 products, will probably reach 200 or 300 products. I mean, India is an economy, where even if in relation to five products, the farmer gets distressed by the inflow of foreign goods, then, his own goods, the pricing gets distressed, then, it is lakhs of farmers or millions of farmers in each tariff line, who are going to be adversely affected.

Lastly, Sir, what is the state of negotiations as far as the NAMA negotiations are concerned, or, is it completely stalemated without any progress at all?

Finally, Sir, before I conclude, I just want to give one suggestion to the hon. Minister. There have been in different areas of governance, several illustrations — Mr. Singh referred to the climate change negotiations, I am not repeating our position on that — where we seem to be getting pressured by the developed world. As far as trade is concerned, foreign policy and trade policy never mix together. You may be the best of friends with certain countries but your trading interests, Sir, always at variance with them. Europe and United States are litigating against each other as far as the WTO is concerned. So, my suggestion to the Minister would be that please keep the current close proximity and the foreign policy emanating out of that and the pressure emanating out of that away as far as India's trading policy is concerned. Thank you.

SHRI M.V. MYSURA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Thank you, Sir. As everybody knows, in these negotiations, the United States is the important player. But they are negotiating without any Fast Track Authority from their Congress or Parliament. They are going on negotiating for their advantage. As our learned colleague, N.K. Singh, said, the major portion of the subsidies are in the Green Box. These subsidies are non-negotiable. If it is so, how the Indian farmer gets a level-playing field in the international market?

The second thing I understand is that the USA is pressurising for increasing the safeguard in agriculture up to 20 per cent. I think, it is almost accepted or going to be accepted at around 5 per cent. I would like the hon. Minister to explain India's position on this.

In the industrial sector and also in the chemicals and pharmaceuticals sector, I understand, they are requesting for reducing the customs duty to zero per cent. Once it is done, their products will flood our market and our chemicals and pharmaceutical sector will be largely hit. So, what is the Government planning to protect these sectors?

Then, Sir, the Geneva Meeting is also over. But, still there is a lot of confusion about the negotiations, what is happening in the negotiations. I request the Minister to publish a White Paper on what is happening in the negotiations.

Then, Sir, the Government has to educate the Indian farmer about the pros and cons of these negotiations and about the WTO outcome. I would like to know from the Minister the steps taken by the Government to empower the agriculturists. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Amar Singh, you just wanted to intervene because somebody else is speaking from your Party.

**श्री अमर सिंह (उत्तर प्रदेश)** : धन्यवाद उपसभापति महोदय। मैं तो इतना ही कहूंगा कि यह मेरा सौभाग्य है कि इधर वाणिज्य मंत्री जी बैठे हैं, मेरे पीछे श्री एन0के0 सिंह पूर्व वाणिज्य सचिव बैठे हैं और नेता प्रतिपक्ष हमारे मित्र श्री अरुण जेटली पूर्व वाणिज्य मंत्री बैठे हैं, इसलिए सदन को गुमराह नहीं किया जा सकता है। सभी वाणिज्य विशेषज्ञ यहां पर बैठे हुए हैं। मैं सिर्फ इतना ही कहना चाहता हूं कि हमने सचमुच में "वसुदैव कुटुम्बकंम" को बहुत गंभीरता से ले लिया है। हम भारत के नागरिक कम और विश्व के नागरिक ज्यादा हो गए हैं, चाहे वह एशियन का मामला हो, उसमें भी हमने केरल के रबड़ और कॉफी के किसानों की चिंता नहीं की, छूट पर छूट दे दी, चाहे WTO का मामला हो। मैं बहुत बुद्धिमान व्यक्ति नहीं हूं, इसलिए मुझे पता नहीं है कि यह ग्रीन बॉक्स है या रेड बॉक्स है, क्या है, उसमें कितनी सबसिडी है ? लेकिन मैं इतना जरूर माननीय मंत्री जी से जानना चाहूंगा कि जो पाश्चात्य देशों के, जो उन्नत देशों के किसान हैं, जिनको बड़ी सबसिडी मिलती है, अगर उनका मुकाबला भारत के किसानों से हो, तो वे किस तरह से उनका मुकाबला कर सकेंगे ?

**[उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो0 पी0जे0 कुरियन) पीठासीन हुए]**

आप विश्व नागरिक बनिए, आप carbon emission भी कर दीजिए, डेवलेप नेशन्स के आगे, अमेरिका के आगे घुटने टेक दीजिए, यहां भी घुटने टेक दीजिए, हमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं है। हमें आपके प्रो-अमेरिकन स्टैंड

से, प्रो-डेवलेप्ड कंट्रीज के स्टैंड से, चाहे वह ग्लोबल वार्मिंग हो, चाहे WTO का मामला हो, सब में आप समर्पण करिए, लेकिन विदेशी किसानों के मुकाबले में हमारे भारत के किसानों का संरक्षण इकॉनामी में कैसे हो, यह आप हमें बता दीजिए, हमें संतुष्ट कर दीजिए और आप अमेरिका की जय हो, जय हो करते रहिए।

**श्री बृजभूषण तिवारी** (उत्तर प्रदेश): महोदय, अभी माननीय मंत्री जी ने जो अपना वक्तव्य दिया है, उसमें उन्होंने कहा है कि "दोहा दौर में भारत के परिप्रेक्ष्य में वार्ता के मुख्य मुद्दे एवं महत्वपूर्ण विषय विकासात्मक आयाम संबंधी कार्य पूरा करना, गरीब किसानों एवं उद्योग जगत के हितों का संरक्षण करना और अपने किसानों एवं उद्योग हेतु अधिकाधिक बाजार अवसर प्राप्त करना है।"

मैं समझता हूं कि इन मुद्दों पर अभी तक कोई सहमति नहीं बनी है। जैसा कि अभी माननीय सदस्यों ने कृषि के क्षेत्र में और सेवा के क्षेत्र में यह प्रश्न उठाया है, परन्तु भारत की सरकार और विशेषकर जो हमारे वाणिज्य मंत्री हैं, वे इतने अति उत्साहित हैं कि वे बराबर इसकी मीटिंग के लिए बड़े प्रयासरत हैं। आप जानते हैं कि विश्व व्यापार संगठन की स्थापना, स्वतंत्र एवं निष्पक्ष व्यापार के जरिए, दुनिया के देशों के करोड़ों गरीबों की गरीबी को गरीबी के चंगुल से मुक्त कराने के लिए की गई थी, लेकिन यह संगठन अपने उद्देश्यों में असफल रहा। जैसा कि माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा है कि संगठन में जो सम्पन्न तथा विकसित देश हैं, उनका बोलबाला है और उन्होंने जो तकनीकी तरीके से नियम बनाए हैं, वे हमारे विरुद्ध हैं। क्योंकि वैश्वीकरण और WTO की नीतियों के लागू किए जाने के बाद से ही दक्षिण एशिया में अमीरी और गरीबी की खाई और चौड़ी हो गई है। UNDP के अनुसार OECD के देश एक दिन में एक अरब डालर की सब्सिडी देते हैं। कृषि सहायता पर OECD द्वारा किए गए व्यय का 50 फीसदी यूरोपीय देशों में और लगभग 40 फीसदी जापान में व्यय किया जाता है। अमेरिका में कृषि सहायता 2 अरब से बढ़कर 28 अरब डालर हो गई है। यह वस्तुस्थिति है, इसलिए जो समाचारपत्रों में खबर छपी है, मैं उसके बारे में माननीय मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूं और मैं उसे कोट भी करना चाहता हूं,

"Actually, WTO Chief Pascal Lamy is right when he said at the inaugural of the ongoing WTO mini-Ministerial meet in New Delhi yesterday that 80 per cent of the issues of the Doha round have been resolved. He was telling the truth. What remains is merely the tightening of the nuts and bolts of the agreement." मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि जो Lamy साहब का बयान है, इसमें कितनी सच्चाई है और उस वस्तुस्थिति से सदन को भी अवगत कराएं? क्योंकि देश में यह भावना बहुत प्रबल होती जा रही है और जैसा कि माननीय श्री अमर सिंह ने अपनी शंका व्यक्त की है कि भारत सरकार की ज्यादा दरियादिली के कारण, जो भारत के किसान हैं, उनका नुकसान हो रहा है तथा भारत के वाणिज्य एवं व्यापार का भी नुकसान हो रहा है। आप जानते हैं कि यूरोप के विकसित देश किस प्रकार की protectionism कर रहे हैं, वे अपना माल तो हमारे बाजार में भेजना चाहते हैं, वे हमारे बाजार को खुला रखना चाहते हैं। अगर उनको पैसा यहां आ सकता है, उनकी पूंजी आ सकती है, तो हमारे लोग वहां पर जाकर क्यों नहीं काम कर सकते हैं? हम अपनी सेवा उनको क्यों उपलब्ध नहीं करा सकते हैं? इसके लिए वे तैयार नहीं हैं, इसलिए जिस प्रकार की ये सेवा शर्तें अथवा नियम WTO द्वारा लागू किए जा रहे हैं, मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहता हूं कि ...**(समय की घंटी)**... इस संबंध में वे अपनी क्या राय रखते हैं, ताकि वह भारत के किसानों, व्यापारियों एवं यहां सेवा में लगे लोगों के हित में हो।

**श्री आर.सी. सिंह** (पश्चिमी बंगाल) : सर, यह जो नेगोसिएशन चल रही है, इससे ऐसा लगता है कि शायद ही हम किसी favourable consideration की तरफ बढ़ रहे हैं। इस राउंड का भविष्य अनेक complications से भरा हुआ है, चाहे वह टेक्नीकल हो या कोई अन्य हो। भारत के हितों की दृष्टि से बहुत

ही महत्वपूर्ण है कि service and Non-agriculture Market Access में थोड़े बहुत फायदे मिलने पर वह किसानों के हितों को न छोड़ दे। सर, इसमें विकसित देशों द्वारा जो सब्सिडाइज्ड एक्सपोर्ट है, वह सबसे बड़ी चिंता का विषय है। जो विकासशील देशों के लिए food and livelihood security के ऊपर खतरा पैदा करती है, इसलिए विकसित देशों को अपने agriculturaL subsidies में कमी लाने के लिए बाध्य करना हमारे जैसे विकासशील देशों के लिए सबसे बड़ा लक्ष्य होना चाहिए।

सर, मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से यह जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या यह सत्य है कि भारत ने trade information system revitalizing of WTO Committees, special legal provision of market access to Least Developing Countries and setting of standards and monitoring of Regional Trade Agreements की स्थापना का प्रस्ताव दिया है? अगर हां, तो क्या यह सत्य है कि ये सभी बातें अभी हाल में चल रही negotiations के main agenda का part नहीं बन सकी हैं? अगर हां, तो मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से इसका कारण जानना चाहूंगा?

सर, मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से यह भी जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या यह सत्य नहीं है कि non-Agriculture Market Access की मौजूदा स्थिति विकासशील देशों के लिए बहुत कठिन स्थिति का निर्माण करेगी, क्योंकि विकसित देश, खासकर USA और EU, अभी भी पुरानी साम्राज्यवादी नीति []divide and rule[] अपना रहे हैं और विकासशील देशों में से कुछ देशों को तो कुछ concessions दे रहे हैं, लेकिन सभी को नहीं दे रहे हैं? अगर हां, तो भारत, जो G-20 और G-30 का सदस्य देश है, किस प्रकार इन सभी को एक साथ रखने में भूमिका निभा पाएगा?

सर, यद्यपि अभी तक विकसित देशों द्वारा दी जाने वाली subsidies पर deadlock बना हुआ है, मैं समझता हूं कि data base से संबंधित technical issues जैसे मुद्दे आगे बढ़ रहे हैं। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से अपेक्षा करूंगा कि वे agriculture services and marketing से संबंधित इन technical issues के बारे में विस्तार से बताएं और इस पर भारत का क्या रख है, वह भी स्पष्ट करें।

सर, हम सभी जानते हैं कि service sector में तुलनात्मक दृष्टि से हम competitive advantage में हैं, लेकिन कुछ ऐसी रिपोर्ट्स हैं कि सरकार service sectors में legal services, accountancy, financial services और media जैसी services को liberlise करने की योजना बना रही है। मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा कि इसके पीछे क्या कारण है? क्या यह सत्य नहीं है कि सर्विसेज से जुड़े लोग इस कदम का विरोध कर रहे हैं? अगर हां, तो इस सेक्टर को liberlize करने के पीछे क्या कारण है?

मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूं कि क्या भारत agriculture and non-agriculture market access के समान services को भी वैसे track पर लाने के लिए प्रयत्न कर रहा है? अगर हां, तो भारत को इससे किस हद तक लाभ होगा? क्या यह सत्य है कि कुछ देश इसका विरोध कर रहे हैं? अगर हां, तो इसका कारण क्या है? क्या इसका कारण भारत सितम्बर, 2009 में जो informal ministerial meeting हुई थी, उसमें services को शामिल नहीं किया जा सकना है? मैं इस संबंध में थोड़ी जानकारी चाहूंगा।

सर, एक बात कहना चाहूंगा कि सरकार को देखना होगा कि किसानों को सब्सिडी वाले आयात में बढ़ोत्तरी के मुकाबले पर्याप्त बिजली, नए और परिष्कृत बीज, बैंक क्रेडिट एवं बाजार तक पहुंचने के लिए सरकार के द्वारा पूर्ण सहयोग मिले, इसकी एक व्यवस्था करने के लिए सरकार को इसकी तरफ अग्रसर होना चाहिए।

सर, दोहा और विकास का दौर नहीं है, यह तो बाजार खोज रही है। विकास का सूत्रधार व्यापार नहीं स्वदेशी आंतरिक साधन होंगे और विकास की पहचान विकास की दर से नहीं, बल्कि रोजगार सृजन और गैर बराबरी निवारण से होगी, इसलिए नई विश्व व्यवस्था आर्थिक मानवीय और स्थायी होनी चाहिए।

DR. E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, first of all, I would congratulate the hon. Minister on his assuming the charge as the Minister of Commerce and Industry in UPA-II. He has created great hope for the people of India that Doha talks will be finished within a particular period of 2010. Now, we feel very happy on hearing that Ministerial talks have led to that level even though negotiations have not been initiated. I would like to quote the statement of the Chilean Finance Minister Mr. Andres Velasco who chaired that particular meeting. He said, "There was strong convergence on importance of trade and the Doha Round to economic recovery and poverty alleviation in the developing countries. The development dimensions should remain central to the Round and particular attention should be paid to issues of importance to developing countries." It is, more or less, reflecting our views, India's, but more emphasis has to be given to poverty alleviation. In which way were the preliminary discussions held? About that, the World Trade Organisation Director General, Pascal Lamy, said, and I quote, Sir:

> "The Ministerial Conference has provided the political energy to organise work for the coming months."

In which way are the other countries cooperating with us to have this political energy? I would like to seek some clarifications from the hon. Minister. Some moratoriums were also imposed, by consent, during the period between one sitting and another sitting of the Ministerial Conference. One is on electronic commerce. Another one is on non-violation under the WTO Intellectual Property Agreement. In which way, is it going to help?

Finally, an additional session they want to have on Climatic Changes with a specific focus on []Aid for the Trade[]. What are the issues on that? Has the Government created a roadmap to have transparency, before going for talks or negotiations, for the common men, *i.e.* agriculturists and stake holders? Many of the people have said that parliamentarians are to be taken into confidence; the stake holders, agriculturists and the entire section of the people who are going to be affected by the negotiations have to be taken into confidence before going for talks, and also during the course of the talks. We feel that somewhere it is missing. When regional talks were held by the ASEAN countries, people from Kerala started saying that they were not consulted and things like that. Over and above that, some chamber consultation was done by the hon. Minister also. That type of allegation should not come up again. There should be a full-fledged discussion even at the level of villages to see that WTO is really meant for the welfare of the people, and also for the welfare of agriculturists. In which way NAMA is going to help them; in which way they are going to be affected and how they can overcome it; these are things to be discussed before we go for negotiations. We first enter into negotiations and, then, tell them that this is the thing happened. Therefore, we oblige for that. Rather, we have to prepare ourselves first. It is a democratic nation and we are part of the democratic process of

WTO. Therefore, we have to practise it so that the people can understand it better. Thank you very much, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Thank you, Mr. Natchiappan. Now, Shri Rahul Bajaj. Actually, it is my name written there; I am not reading it. I am giving my chance to you!

SHRI RAHUL BAJAJ (Maharashtra): Sir, I fully associate myself with the comments made by two learned speakers, especially Mr. N.K. Singh and Mr. Arun Jaitley. I think, they have made very valid points.

From the last but one para of the Minister's Statement, we are happy to learn that while negotiating this Round, which has started from 2001, the essence of this Round, as we all know, is the development aspect of the Round, which means like climate change, common but differentiated responsibilities, less than full reciprocity. That has to be kept in mind. And, Sir, we note that protecting the interest of poor farmers and of Indian industry and seeking greater market opportunities for our farmers and industry are the key elements. That is absolutely correct. Though, for agriculture — I think, Mr. Jaitley also said so — by and large, for the coming years, our interests are going to be more defensive, rather than offensive, the subsidy is given especially, Sir, by the US, France and Japan. Sir, as we talk of the US, both domestic support and export subsidy, of course, they have tariffs for agricultural products, is so serious as our former Commerce Minister said: "However inefficient the Indian farmer may be, he can successfully compete with the US farmers." That is why the US farmer needs subsidy but the Indian Treasury cannot compete with the US Treasury. So, we have to keep in mind the situation that is prevailing today. In Hindi, we say, Sir, "उलटा चोर कोतवाल को डाँटे।"

Climate change is very similar, except for the last night announcement by the US which has to be studied. Similar is the case with the WTO. For years and, in fact, for decades, we in the developing world were preached the benefits of free trade. Now those very countries, and I talk especially of the US but it applies to all developed countries, do not want to even practise fair trade, leave alone free trade. We will protect our farmers; we will give legitimate protection to our industry, etc. But while negotiating, we recognise that it is a question of give and take. Till now even under the Swiss formula, which was referred to — I wouldn't go into those co-efficients that there are three alternatives depending on what kind of freedom that you want — I believe we have already given more than we should. Whether you can plough back some of them depends on the Minister. That is one of my questions. Will you be able to plough back? It is difficult. I want to emphasise that we from the Indian industry have already given our views. It applies to the bound rates. But, as Mr. Arun Jaitely has stated, first, we would like to know

whether the reduction, whether the percentage reduction, that India and developing countries will make is much more than what the US will make. We were higher, but we are no longer that higher. How many of our reduced bound rates will go below the applied rates?

Secondly, I believe that 30 per cent of our items, tariff lines, were not bound. Now almost all the tariff lines will become unbound. I would like to know, through you, Sir, from the hon. Minister whether it is true.

In any case, it is give and take. But they have been only taking. Before 1991, in the early nineties, Mr. Vice-Chairman, we had a closed economy. We had very high rates of import tariff. We, the Indian industry, were shouting against that. But the condition has changed. In any case, I would like to request the hon. Minister that he should not give in. He should not give in at all on the sectoral zero duty situation. That is one. He should not give in — I don't have time to go into the detail — on the remanufactured products. They are keen on that. He should not give in at all on the anti-concentration clause. Giving in on any of these factors will tremendously hurt India, the Indian economy and our development process. We are already under pressure at Copenhagen. But in these things he should not give in at all.

Finally, they are very strong negotiators. I think, Mr. Natchiappan, mentioned it in a different context. Their businessmen met with their Government to negotiate in Geneva. When they talk, we don't know who the businessman is and who the Government representative is. They are one. Here you don't take our business representatives. Even if you take them, since the time of Mr. Arun Jaitley, Mr. Kamal Nath and now Mr. Sharma, you keep them outside. You don't let them come in. So, this must be done for the Indian industry, Indian farmers and the Indian economy to have interaction within India. They do discuss. But it is not enough. More interaction is required to see that we don't give in to the bullying tactics, especially, of the US. I agree that we have very good relations with the US. I have good friends in America. I studied in America. It is a great country. But a country which only wants to protect its interests, which does not care at all for other country's interests, we have to put a full stop. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Now, Mr. Minister. *(Interruptions)*... Please. The Minister is replying. Please. The Minister is replying.

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman. I would like to thank the hon. Members, through you, Sir, for their interventions in this Calling Attention Motion which has been brought forward by Shri Moinul Hassan and Shri N.K. Singh. I also benefited from the inputs from the learned Leader of the Opposition, who has himself held this responsibility in the previous Government, and, surely, he

is fully aware of the terrain, the pitfalls, the skills of India's negotiators and the various positions that India has taken in this Round of trade negotiations.

Sir, at the outset, I would like to say and make it very clear that this Round has one core agenda, that is, development. It is meant to ensure that for the developing countries, the poor countries and the LDCs, who have been historically disadvantaged when it comes to global trade, market access, that includes both the nascent industries as well as the farmers or the agriculture produce there is, as was said, a level playing field and the interests of the vulnerable economies, the developing countries are fully protected. It is meant, therefore, to correct the distortion and imbalance. Therefore, the Doha Round has special significance. The developing and the poor countries have much to gain from the successful conclusion of the Doha Round. I am afraid to say that they will have the most to lose if this round does not lead to a rule-based multilateral trade regime which addresses the legitimate concerns and aspirations of the developing countries.

Sir, last year, as I mentioned in my statement, there was a Mini-Ministerial in July, 2008 which did not lead to convergence of views on some of the critical issues which were of import to the developing countries including India. These negotiations did not proceed and, if I may use the word, hit a roadblock. In the global parlance many words have been used, Since I assumed this responsibility; it was said that the talks were paused and the talks had stalled. The fact is, there was a roadblock. At the same time, there was an increasing demand and urging by the leadership of the developing countries and the poor countries that this Round should be saved, efforts should be made to revive and to take it to a successful conclusion. Sir, it was in June itself. Those were early days for me. I was trying to go up an a steep learning curve, not familiar with the details at that time but more familiar with the broad rules and principles. There was a meeting of the Cairns Group in Bali in Indonesia where there was talk of new processes which virtually meant to start all over again. This theory was being marketed or propounded by the developed countries, those who did not have the will to take the process forward. Much has been invested in these talks in the last eight years, as Shri N.K. Singh knows. He knows it from both sides, being part of the Government, Senior Secretary, Principle Secretary to the then Prime Minister. He knows about commerce. Since 2001, much was invested in this Round. India had taken a clear position to ensure that this Round serves the interests of the developing countries. I had then said, Sir, that the need was to reenergise and not to reinvent; reenergise the process by using the draft documents, draft reports on agriculture and NAMA which were submitted in December, 2008, but never discussed, never got looked into. There were a number of calls from various world leaders at Summits, whether it was the G-20 in London, or the L'Aquila Summit Declaration urging the Ministers to help to take the initiative to revive the process. India talked to its coalition partners in the developing countries, the G-20, the G-33

and the NAMA-11. The Coordinator of the G-20 is Brazil. The G-33, which has made a very useful contribution in upholding our position and concerns on agriculture, is chaired by Indonesia. The NAMA, Non-Agriculture Market Access Group is chaired by South Africa.

Sir, through our discussions with our coalition partners, we suggested to put together a mini-Ministerial in Delhi, representing the coalition or carcas of all stakeholders in the developing and poor countries in the LDCs and also the key interlocutors from the developed countries. But, before we did that, before sending the invitations, we had a meeting of the developing countries, a coalition on the margins of the OECD Ministerial in Paris. That was again in June. And, the IBSA Ministers met at India's initiative. IBSA is an important initiative of three continents, of three emerging economies and vibrant democracies, namely, India, Brazil and South Africa. We made it abundantly clear in that statement that the developing countries had made enough concessions, and there is no room for any unilateral concessions by the developing or poor countries. I had taken the liberty to share the IBSA's statement with the prominent Leaders of the Opposition, both in the Lok Sabha and in the Rajya Sabha. I shared it with my dear friend, Shri Sitaram Yechury, Shri Raja, and in the other House with Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi and Shri Sharad Joshi. It was to reassure that there is no question of India, while trying to re-energise the process, taking a position which casts any shadow or any doubt when it comes to our engagement and solidarity with the poor and developing countries of the world.

Sir, in September, we had the Delhi Ministerial. It was a representative meeting attended by, literally, the microcosm of the WTO reflecting the entire membership from the developing countries, the African Group, the LDCs, small and vulnerable economies and the Cotton-4. We also had the key interlocutors from the developed countries, namely, the U.S., the E.U., Japan, Canada and Australia. There was a consensus reached that negotiations should resume. We did not discuss the substance, but about the process as to how to resume the stalled negotiations.

There was a reference made here by hon. Members, and I fully agree with their concerns that there has been an adverse impact of the global economic crisis on all economies. Trade has been hit. In case of India too, our exports started declining in October, 2008. While quickly add, to reassure Shri Moinul Hassan, the various interventions and the measures which the Government took and the new Foreign Trade Policy, focussing primarily on labour-intensive sectors, have helped in arresting the steep fall and reversing the trend. While we were falling in the negative, close to 40 per cent in May, the last month's figures were only six per cent. We have been able to drag it down to a single digit. But it is true that the global trade has shrunk. The WTO projections, the hon. Member was right, are that the global trade will fall by 9 per cent,

and the IMF feels, maybe, by 12 per cent. Therefore, it is important that the trade negotiations are taken forward, as enhanced engagement, economic engagement, will help all countries, whether developing or developed.

Sir, various issues have come up — these have even been raised by the hon. Members — on agriculture, on NAMA and on the services sector. Sir, in agriculture, our position is very clear. First of all, it is special and differential treatment. We are talking of developing countries getting a special dispensation and for which, in addition to the concessions which we have, there are three important things which I want to mention. One is, the special products. The special products in agriculture which the developing countries will designate, these will be self-designated, where no tariff cuts will be taken. There is also the issue of what was raised by Shri Arun Jaitley about the farmers from the big countries, the rich farmers and if there is a surge, how to protect our farmers? Sir, it is very clear, again, besides the special products, the second is the operational and effective special safeguard mechanism. They have to be less burdensome; they have to be easily operational because it is not only the volume surge, even if there is a price distortion or price dip. Discussions are going on about the trigger, but, this is to protect our farmers and our agriculture sector. And also, the question raised, and rightly so of subsidies by the rich countries whether it is the United States of America or Canada or the European Union where huge subsidies are given to the farmers, price support is there. Subsidies are also given, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition knows, to keep the production low. So, there are all kinds of subsidies which are trade distorting, which are not acceptable. India, along with its coalition partners has made it very clear that these subsidies shall have to be drastically cut. The developed countries, America and the E.U. will have to make deep cuts in the subsidies, minimum 70 per cent, and this is still being negotiated. So, there is no question of accepting a situation where these trade distortions and these huge subsidies shall be allowed and an agreement is reached. There cannot be any agreement with these subsidies in place. I can assure you.

There is also the issue of tariff simplification and tariff capping of the developed countries; the issue of developed countries tariffs in agriculture. And there, India is engaged, once again, very pro-actively with G-20 and G-33. Since this matter was raised just now by an hon. Member as to where we stand when it comes to G-20 and G-33, I would like to inform the House that on the Margins of the WTO Ministerial in Geneva, which was not meant for substantive negotiations but to review the WTO functioning and also the global economic crisis and its adverse impact on the world trade, we had the meeting of the G-20 and the G-33. The G-20 and G-33 communiques are in public domain. We have taken a firm stand and categorical position when it comes to both our position on agriculture and also on NAMA. Because on NAMA, Sir, here we are talking of Non-Agricultural Market Access. Now, how do we safeguard our vulnerable

industries in the developing countries? Therefore, the developing countries, again, as the principle of special and differential treatment, are going to have flexibilities. Flexibilities in those sectors, those lines where we don't want to take any tariff cuts. Those flexibilities shall be the sole discretion, on our judgement, as to which flexibilities we want to take, which are the sectors where we will not take cuts, zero cut. Again, the NAMA flexibilities principle is integral to the negotiations. Shri Rahul Bajaj had asked, and rightly so, about our position on sectorals. There was Hong Kong Ministerial meeting in 2005 which has taken some decisions, and it is clear that sectorals will be non-mandatory for the developing countries and poor countries. There cannot be any mandatory engagement by India, its coalition partners, in sectorals which will figure in the agreement. We will not accept the mandatory principle; we have made it abundantly clear at the WTO in the negotiations.

Also, on the re-manufactured goods, let me assure my dear friend, Shri Rahul Bajaj, there is no question of India yielding. We will not accept it. Now, when it comes to certain other issues which the hon. Members have raised, one is on meaningful market access, as to what the USA has said. Sir, for the benefit of hon. Members and for the sake of record, let me mention that these are multi-lateral negotiations. We know about the Uruguay Round; it went on for a long time. These round negotiations have been going on since the last 8 years. One hundred and fifty three countries are engaged in these negotiations. These DOHA countries come from different levels of development; the nature of challenges, developmental issues and their concerns are different. Many are common when it comes to the developing countries and the poor countries. Multi-lateral negotiations primarily mean that countries have their position; but they negotiate to find a middle-ground where each country—poor, vulnerable economies, developing countries, emerging economies or the rich countries—is comfortable to stand. As I have said, we have made it clear even now in this meeting in Geneva in our statement. I shall, for the benefit of hon. Members, read the four salient points which I have highlighted in Geneva, as our position: (A) There can be no dilution of development objective of the Round and there is a need for sympathetic understanding of the concerns of the developing world. (B) In the process of bridging the gaps in negotiations, there cannot be any reversion of the broad understandings reached in the past eight years. (C) Demands for additional market access in developing countries need to be tapered by the development agenda and not driven by commercial considerations. (D) The centrality of the multi-lateral process in negotiations must be maintained.

This is, broadly speaking, India's position which we articulated in the recent WTO Ministerial meeting. There is a question raised about NAMA co-efficients and on the tariffs. Hon. Leader of the Opposition knows, so does Shri N.K. Singh, that there has been a gradual reduction of tariffs over a period of time. What tariffs? There are bound tariffs and there are

applied tariffs. Our bound tariffs are very high. Reduction of tariff, when a view is taken, does not take away your sovereign inherent right to raise it, even up to the bound level if any time the situation demands. What is being negotiated are the bound tariffs. So, our learned Member, Shri N.K. Singh, knows that better than me.

Sir, on co-efficients and flexibilities, I would be very clear, these issues are not frozen, not settled. They are not settled. Negotiations are on, but, as we have said, I have made our position on tariffs very clear. We are also determined to protect when it comes to our industry, particularly, the vulnerable sections.

Shri Jaitley had made this reference to the green box being negotiated. It did. But, we are very clear when it comes to ensuring that India is a developing country, its interests are not hurt. The present bound tariffs when we are concerned with agriculture are 114 per cent and India has, I can say with a sense of responsibility, clarity about its objective, commitment to uphold its supreme national interest and also, if I may say so, enough role for our negotiators to initiate an agreement which eventually serves the interests of the developing countries, of our vulnerable industries of our farmers. Sir, on meaningful market access, I had deviated a bit from there, I will go back. On meaningful market access, I was mentioning what the United States wants. Countries articulate their positions. They come with their positions but they also negotiate. They try to harmonise positions. It should be very clear. Harmonising our positions without compromising our interest is something which we are for. But not harmonising our position where our interests gets affected, there is no question of dilution. There is no question of negotiation when it comes to that. But, Sir, even in United States of America, developed countries and EU, it is true that they also have their expectations. Like we have our aspirations and concerns, they have their own expectations. But, it does not mean that they will get what they demand in a statement. It is a general statement which is made. Our negotiators know what the mandate is and what they are negotiating for. Sir, one issue which was rightly raised is about the services. It is true that India has its strength in the services sector and it is not a question that we have not given priority to the services negotiations. The negotiations are very much on. The same Hong Kong Ministerial which had taken the decision, which I referred to on the sectorals, also took a view on sequencing and in the sequencing agreed to in the 2005 Hong Kong Ministerial it was agriculture, NAMA and services. When we had the meeting in Delhi we made it abundantly clear to the key interlocutors from the developed countries and also to the DG of the WTO that services negotiations have to be taken upfront because we have our interests and there is no question of our agreeing only to those sectors where the developed countries are interested.

We are clear that it has to be concluded as a single undertaking. The present round of negotiations and services will be an integral part. So, on the services, if I may just inform that at the WTO Negotiations on trade in services are unlike those in agriculture and NAMA and industrial goods as there are no tariffs which are quantifiable when it comes to services. Therefore, India's position is clear that our interests out of the four modes in two are very strong. That is mode one on cross border supply and mode four is a movement of professionals. We hope when the negotiations move forward we will be in a position to assess carefully after the text-based negotiations resume now, as has been agreed, and those revised drafts on agriculture and NAMA and on the services negotiations, which will be horizontally taken up after a few months, I can say, we would be better placed to assess where we are at that stage. Sir, before I conclude, I would like to say two more things.

The first one is whether the W.T.O. is dictating. Shri N.K. Singh knows that the W.T.O. is a membership-driven organisation. The Secretariat can compile. The Secretariat is meant for that and it is paid for that. But, it is the political leaders and the Member countries of the W.T.O. who will decide what to do. The Secretariat does not decide in any multilateral organisation — whether it be the UN or the WIPO or the WTO. So, there is no question of harbouring any fears or concerns on that. Sir, I may also say, hon. Member, Shri Amar Singhji, has expressed concern about the farmers. I am very happy.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: I hope the hon. Minister will have the same volume when he argues for us in the W.T.O.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Do not worry. I have no doubt, Arun.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): I believe, he will.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, the hon. Leader of the Opposition should not have any doubt. In fact, I am always here to say what the status is. We shall continue to do so, because we are a democracy. We would like, as a Government and I as a Minister, to keep the hon. Leader of the Opposition, hon. Members in the Opposition and my own colleagues in the Treasury Benches, to fully apprise of the developments at every stage.

But, just to assure Shri Amar Singh about his concern whether we will come under the pressure. Hon. Leader of the Opposition has also said the same. Sir, there is no question of coming under pressure when it comes to trade policy. India will come under only one pressure, the pressure of its interest, the pressure of its people and the pressure of its farmers. There is no question of we being pro-America. Sir, Shri Amar Singh knows America much better than me. He knows Mr. Bill Clinton, Ms. Hillary Clinton. He supports them in the foundation. I didn't do that. So, please do not have any concern...

SHRI AMAR SINGH: That is the reason for his apprehension.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, I will make it clear where we are and we are pro-whom.

SHRI AMAR SINGH: Since he has mentioned my name, I will respond to it after his reply.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: It is said in a positive sense. Surely, I have no objection to his engagement.

Sir, what I am saying is 'where we are.' I am just concluding. We are pro-whom? We are pro-India, if our commitment is to uphold the supreme national interest of this country. Sir, when we take the negotiations forward, we are clear that historical distortions must be corrected. There should be a rule-based global trade regime which protects the livelihood concerns of the subsistence farmers in the developing countries, the poor in the developing countries, also ensures food security and protection for the vulnerable industrial sectors.

I would like to thank the hon. Members who gave me this opportunity to share my views. Thank you.

SHRI AMAR SINGH: Sir, the hon. Minister has taken my name. उन्होंने मेरा नाम लिया है, तो मैं इतना ही कहना चाहूंगा कि प्रधान मंत्री मनमोहन सिंह जी की जानकारी में मेरी दोस्ती क्लिंटन दंपति से है। बिल क्लिंटन से ज्यादा है और हिलेरी क्लिंटन से उनकी पत्नी के नाते हैं। मैंने फाउंडेशन की मदद किसी ऐसे तरीके से नहीं की है कि मैंने देश के किसी कानून का उल्लंघन किया है। अगर ऐसा किया है, तो वे जांच करवा लें। ...(व्यवधान).. वे जांच करवा लें और दूसरी बात यह है कि मैंने यह न्यूक्लियर डील को करवाने के लिए किया है। इनकी न्यूक्लियर ....(व्यवधान).... रिपब्लिकन्स सपोर्ट कर रहे थे और डेमोक्रेट्स विरोध कर रहे थे, तो उन्होंने मेरा इस्तेमाल किया है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): The House is adjourned for lunch for one hour.

---

The House then adjourned for lunch at fifty-nine minutes past one of the clock.

The House re-assembled after lunch at three of the clock,
MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

## SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (GENERAL), 2009-10

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI NAMO NARAIN MEENA): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, a statement (in English and Hindi) showing the Supplementary Demands for Grants (General) for the year 2009-10.

---